

**INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

FOR:

Educational Recovery Clinic

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS		OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
Tutor Qualifications		Lesson matches original description	Unsatisfactory	Criminal Background Checks	
Recruiting Materials		Instruction is clear	Unsatisfactory	Health/safety laws & regulations	
Academic Program		Time on task is appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
Progress Reporting		Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
		Student/instructor ratio: 5-4:1	Satisfactory		

ACTION NEEDED: NONE

- 1) ERC submitted a corrective action plan that a) described how it will ensure in the future that tutors are using lesson plans and materials with activities that are age and ability level appropriate and designed to address individual student “skill gaps” as described in the application, b) provided a description of the ways in which ERC has and will provide additional support and training to tutors in effective classroom and behavior management, c) described methods ERC will use to ensure that session length is adequate to provide the appropriate level of instruction needed to accomplish lesson goals, and d) the process that ERC will use to evaluate the effectiveness of tutors in implementing the program appropriately and accurately, as well as consequences that will be utilized for tutors who are not performing appropriately. This part of the corrective action plan included a copy of ERC’s tutor evaluation form.

(As per the on-site monitoring overview document, while monitoring/ observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Educational Recovery Clinic’s document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components

NAME OF PROVIDER: Educational Recovery Clinic
SITE: Caze Elementary School (Evansville, IN)
TUTOR’S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): P.H., K.D., & J.J
NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 3

DATE: 3-14-07
REVIEWER: ST & MC
TIME OF OBSERVATION: 3:15pm

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of “Satisfactory” (S) or “Unsatisfactory” (U) for each component. Providers receiving a “U” in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
Lesson matches original description in provider application		U	Students worked in small groups with a tutor on math or language arts related lessons. Two separate groups focused on math lessons and completed an addition activity in which the students were given an answer to an addition problem and had to determine what numbers were added together to obtain the answer or a subtraction activity in which the students solved subtraction problems on a worksheet and shaded shapes with specific answers a certain color. In the language arts group, students took turns reading words from a worksheet they had completed and shared their responses. Tutoring sessions were supposed to be an hour but actually they were less than 45 minutes since tutors concluded the lessons 15 or more minutes early in order to walk students to the bus. This (i.e. the need to end the session early) appeared to create a rushed learning environment for two of the three groups observed which made it difficult for students to receive the level of instruction they needed to receive in order to master the concepts being taught. In addition, it was not evident that lessons were structured to meet each individual student’s “skill gap” as described in the application.
Instruction is clear		U	In one of the math groups, the tutor provided directions in a format that students could easily comprehend. However, in the other math group, the students were given an assignment on a concept (regrouping) that they had not covered in tutoring yet. Students were very confused regarding how to solve many of the math problems on their worksheet that involved this concept. The tutor rushed to finish the lesson so instead of explaining regrouping or providing another worksheet that was appropriate for the day’s lesson, the tutor gave the students the answers to the regrouping problems since they had not covered this topic. In addition, during the language arts lesson, it was not always clear that students understood the meanings of words used or even how to pronounce them. This tutor also appeared to be rushed to finish the lesson and did not make attempts to provide clarification to assist students that were having difficulty.
Time on task is appropriate	S		In two of the three groups observed, for the most part, students were engaged and remained on task during the lessons. However, one of the math groups was at times chaotic due to classroom behavior issues of almost every student. In this group students spoke out of term during the lesson explanation, intentionally distracted each other, made frequent (unsupervised) bathroom visits, and sometimes purposefully answered questions wrong, which combined made it a difficult task to accomplish the activities related to the lesson.
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	S		The tutor with one of the math groups had a good rapport with the students and was easily able to use techniques to redirect or engage students in the lesson. However, the other math tutor appeared to have a great deal of difficulty using effective classroom behavior management skills to ensure that student behavior during the lesson was not disruptive. The tutor did share that a card system to reward or discourage behavior had been implemented but this system did not appear to be effective for the group. Also, both math tutors encouraged and allowed students to count on their fingers rather than providing them with other methods or manipulatives to add or subtract. In addition, although it may have been due to being rushed to finish the lesson, the language arts tutor did not appear to be able to employ strategies to facilitate student comprehension of words or correct pronunciation.
Student/instructor ratio: <u>5-4:1</u>	S		Application notes that the ratio will be 8-5:1 and that instruction will be one-on-one or in small groups. A 5-4:1 ratio and small group instruction were observed.

